IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

AETHER THERAPEUTICS INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 20-381-MN

ASTRAZENECA AB, ASTRAZENECA PHARMACEUTICALS LP, and NEKTAR THERAPEUTICS,

Defendants.

AETHER THERAPEUTICS INC.,

Case No. 21-248-MN

Plaintiff,

v.

REDHILL BIOPHARMA INC.

Defendant.

[PLAINTIFF'S PROPOSED] VERDICT FORM INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY REGARDING THE VERDICT FORM

When answering the following questions and filling out this Verdict Form, please follow the directions provided throughout the form. Your answer to each question must be unanimous. Some of the questions contain legal terms that are defined and explained in detail in the Jury Instructions. Please refer to the Jury Instructions if you are unsure about the meaning or usage of any legal term that appears in the questions below.

We, the jury, unanimously agree to the answers to the following questions and return them under the instructions of this court as our verdict in this case.

FINDINGS ON INFRINGEMENT CLAIMS

(The questions regarding infringement should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to the validity or invalidity of the patent.)

A. Inducing Infringement

1. Has Aether Therapeutics Inc. ("Aether") proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AstraZeneca AB and AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP ("AstraZeneca") induced infringement of the following asserted claims?

'488 PATENT

2. Has Aether Therapeutics Inc. ("Aether") proven by a preponderance of the evidence that Nektar Therapeutics ("Nektar") induced infringement of the following asserted claims?

'488 PATENT

3. Has Aether Therapeutics Inc. ("Aether") proven by a preponderance of the evidence that RedHill Biopharma Inc. ("RedHill") induced infringement of the following asserted claims?

'488 PATENT

CLAIM 25	Yes (For Aether)	No (For RedHill)
CLAIM 26	Yes (For Aether)	No (For RedHill)
CLAIM 29	Yes (For Aether)	No (For RedHill)

B. Contributory Infringement

4. Has Aether Therapeutics Inc. ("Aether") proven by a preponderance of the evidence that AstraZeneca AB and AstraZeneca Pharmaceuticals LP ("AstraZeneca") contributed to the infringement of the following asserted claims?

'488 PATENT

5. Has Aether Therapeutics Inc. ("Aether") proven by a preponderance of the evidence that RedHill Biopharma Inc. ("RedHill") contributed to the infringement of the following asserted claims?

'488 PATENT

CLAIM 25	Yes (For Aether)	No (For RedHill)
CLAIM 26	Yes (For Aether)	No (For RedHill)
CLAIM 29	Yes (For Aether)	No(For RedHill)

If you answer "YES" to questions 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 for any of the claims, go to questions 6, 7 and 8 and answer questions 6, 7 and 8. If you did not so answer, go to question 9.

6. infringement v	- •	a preponderance of the evidence that AstraZeneca's
	Yes (For Aether)	No(For AstraZeneca)
7. was willful?	Has Aether proven by	a preponderance of the evidence that Nektar's infringement
	Yes (For Aether)	No (For Nektar)

8. Has Aether proven by a preponderance of the evidence that RedHill's infringement was willful?

Yes No For Aether) No (For RedHill)

FINDINGS ON INVALIDITY DEFENSES

(The questions regarding invalidity should be answered regardless of your findings with respect to infringement.)

A. Anticipation

9. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that the asserted claims of the '488 Patent are invalid due to anticipation?

'488 PATENT

Willful Infringement

C.

CLAIM 25	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)
CLAIM 26	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)
CLAIM 29	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)

B. Obviousness

10. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that the claimed inventions would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art in light of the prior art?

'488 PATENT

CLAIM 25	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)
CLAIM 26	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)
CLAIM 29	Yes (For Defendants)	No (For Aether)

C. Invalidity – Lack of Adequate Written Description

11. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that the specification of the '488 Patent does not contain an adequate written description of the claimed invention?

'488 PATENT

D. Invalidity - Non-Enablement

12. Have Defendants proven by clear and convincing evidence that the specification of the '488 Patent does not enable the claimed invention?

'488 PATENT

CLAIM 25	Yes	No
	(For Defendants)	(For Aether)
CLAIM 26	Yes	No
	(For Defendants)	(For Aether)
CLAIM 29	Yes	No
	(For Defendants)	(For Aether)

FINDINGS ON DAMAGES

If you answered "YES" to any asserted claim in questions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 6, and answered "NO" to the corresponding claim in questions: 9, 10, 11, and 12, proceed to answer the remaining questions. If you did not so answer, do not answer the remaining questions and proceed to check and sign the verdict form.

A.	Damages		
that i	13. What amount of	damages has Aether proven by a preponderance bly royalty for Nektar's and AstraZeneca's infri	
	\$	_	
that i		damages has Aether proven by a preponderance ble royalty for RedHill's infringement of the '48	
	\$	_	
		ous determinations. All members of the jury sho	_
belov forep shoul	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury herson should then notify the	as reached a unanimous verdict on these questions as security guard that you have reached a verdical	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the troom.	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the troom.	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the troom.	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the troom.	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson
belov forep shoul court	w to indicate that the jury hoerson should then notify the ld retain possession of the troom.	as reached a unanimous verdict on these question is security guard that you have reached a verdict verdict form and bring it when the jury is brough	ons. The t. The foreperson

Case 1:21-cv-00248-MN Document 208 Filed 02/27/23 Page 7 of 7 PageID #: 7732